

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Advisory Action dated November 5, 2010 and the Office Action dated July 27, 2010, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the application.

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite “wherein the configuration data comprises profile information including parameters and variables of a profile sequence.” Support for this language can be found at, for example, page 10, lines 29-30 and page 12, lines 9-12 of the Applicant’s originally filed specification.

**I. Rejection of claims 1-19 and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-19 and 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (US 5,408,520) in view of Holmstrom (US 6,907,265).

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 now recites:

A method of supplying configuration data to a mobile telephony device equipped with AT command management means, the method comprising: i) setting up a connection between said device and a terminal containing service configuration data and ii) after the setting up the connection, **exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret, wherein the configuration data comprises profile information including parameters and variables of a profile sequence**

Claim 1 now recites “**wherein the configuration data comprises profile information including parameters and variables of a profile sequence.**” Applicant submits that the art cited by the Examiner does not teach at least this element of claim 1.

Further, Clark is directed to a modem for tight coupling between a computer and a cellular telephone. A modem includes connections for land lines and cellular phones and contains high and low level routines that allow it to perform standard AT commands rationally when connected to a cellular phone. See Abstract.

Holmstrom is directed to a system and method for providing a packet-switched connection such as GPRS, to a portable computer of a mobile station. See Abstract.

However, Clark and Holmstrom are not directed to a method of supplying configuration data to a mobile telephony device equipped with AT command management means. Specifically, Clark and Holmstrom are not directed to supplying configuration data or exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands.

Clark, col. 5, line 42 to col. 6, line 46, describes configurations of the laptop computer 10 the modem 12 and the cellular phone 12. Fig. 1A shows a configuration in which the laptop computer 10 and the modem 12 are connected by way of an RJ11 type jack 14 and a cable 20 to a telephone wall outlet 18. Fig. 1B shows a configuration with the laptop computer 10, but in this configuration, the modem 12 is connected to a cellular phone 22 via an RJ45 type jack 16 by an interface cable 20. Fig. 1C shows a configuration with the laptop computer 10 and modem 12 configured for operation in a foreign country. Fig. 1D illustrates another configuration of the laptop computer 10 with the modem 12.

However, as discussed above, Clark merely describes the different connections between the laptop computer 10, modem 12, cellular phone 22 and the various types of jacks, cables and outlets. There is no teaching or suggestion in Clark of “setting up a connection between said device and a terminal **containing service configuration data**.” Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that the laptop computer 10, which the Examiner cites for teaching the claimed terminal, contains service configuration data, let alone, that a connection is set up between the cellular phone 22 (mobile telephony device) and the laptop 10 (terminal) containing **service configuration data**.

Clark does not teach or suggest that configuration data is supplied to the cellular phone 22. As discussed above, Clark merely describes the configuration of the laptop computer 10 with the modem 12, the cellular phone 22 and the telephone wall outlet 18. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion that the laptop 10 (terminal as cited by the Examiner) contains service configuration data or that after setting up the connection, exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion of exchanging service configuration data between the laptop computer 10 and the cellular phone 22.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that each cellular phone 22, to which the modem is to be connected, has different vendor cellular primitive routines 316 and 318. Therefore, the Examiner reasons that the modem sending the commands and instructions and or directing the phone, reads on the configuration data that is sent to the phone. However, Applicant notes that the laptop computer 10, and not the modem 12, was cited for teaching the

claimed terminal. Further, the modem 12 does not teach or suggest the claimed terminal which is connected to a device, and the modem 12 does not contain service configuration data.

The Examiner states that Clark does not teach “the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret.” However, Applicant submits that the claim recites “exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret.” Therefore, as recited in claim 1, service configuration data is exchanged between a terminal and a device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret.

Holmstrom discloses an AT command set and setting up the physical links for circuit switching and packet switching, citing aspects of cols. 2-5 in support. Holmstrom discloses adapting a portable computer to an existing mobile station so as to be instantly capable of supporting packet-switched connections (e.g. GPRS). See col. 1, lines 5-10. Therefore, Holmstrom does not teach or suggest exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret.

Therefore, the combination of Clark and Holmstrom does not teach the elements of claim 1. Consequently, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 and 19-27 should be deemed allowable.

To the extent independent claim 9 recites similar subject matter, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-18 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

**Claim 26**

Claim 26 recites, *inter alia*,:

wherein the exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands comprises the terminal receiving at least one of **configuration data defining new profiles for the device or updating profiles already stored in the terminal for the device.**

The Examiner asserts that col. 1, lines 23-38 and col. 2, lines 43-51 of Holmstrom teach this aspect of the claim. The aspects of Holmstrom cited by the Examiner describes the use of AT commands for communicating between a computer and a modem.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed configuration data, let alone, that the configuration data **defines new profiles for the device or updating profiles** already stored in the terminal for the device. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion of defining new profiles for the cellular phone 22 (device as cited by the Examiner) or updating profiles already stored in the laptop computer 10 (terminal as cited by the Examiner) for the cellular phone 22.

Therefore, claim 26 should further be deemed allowable.

**II. Rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Holmstrom and further in view of Kobayashi (US 6,633,759). Claim 20 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Kobayashi does not cure the deficiencies of Clark and Holmstrom discussed above.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

Date: November 29, 2010